

## REMARKS

Claims 1-12 remain pending in the present Application. The Specification has been amended to correct certain typographical errors, as explained in detail below. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### Objection to the Specification

In Applicants previous response, an amended Abstract was presented that was clear and concise and believed to be in compliance with the rules. The amended Abstract did not include the phrases "This disclosure concerns", "This disclosure defined by this invention", "This disclosure describes", etc.

Accordingly the rejection is requested to be withdrawn.

### Objection to Claim 2

Claim 2 is objected to under 35 USC 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of Claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse.

In Claim 1, the component layer contains a compound represented by Formula 1. The light emissive layer of Claim 1 may or not contain a compound represented by Formula 1 as Claim 1 is written. That is, Claim 1 does not necessarily require that the light emission layer contains a compound represented by Formula 1. In contrast, Claim 2 depends from Claim 1 and provides te additional limitation that the light emission layer contain the compound of Formula 1 and requires that the light emission layer does contain the compound of Formula 1.

Accordingly, the objection is requested to be withdrawn.

KOT-0084

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-4 and 6-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly anticipated by US Patent Publication No. 2003/0205696 to Thoms et al. (hereinafter Thoms). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In making the 102 rejection, the Examiner states that "Thoms discloses a guest host system emissive system used in organic light emitting devices. Paragraph [0012] of the reference discloses that the host is a carbazole based compound having a structure, which has a two fold axis of symmetry." In actuality, this compound has a three-fold axis of symmetry not a two-fold axis of symmetry. The compound when rotated by 120, 240 and 360 degrees (three times) returns to the original structure such that  $n=3$ .

For ease in understanding the differences in axis of symmetry, Thom's carbazole based compound has a chemical structure similar to formula 4 on page 23 of Applicants specification, which as noted has a three fold axis of symmetry. Compounds exhibiting an axis of symmetry are outside the scope of the application.

Regardless, it is noted that the compound in Applicants' Claim 1 does not have an n-fold axis of symmetry. Thus, whether the compound noted in Thoms has a two-fold or three-fold axis of symmetry is irrelevant since Applicants claim a compound that does not have nay axis of symmetry.

Moreover, as is apparent in Applicants' Table 1 on page 84, inventive organic EL element samples provide excellent emission luminance emission efficiency, and durability as compared with comparative examples having an axis of symmetry.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn since Applicants claim a component layer formed of a compound represented by a formula that does not have an n-fold axis of symmetry.


It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly,

KOT-0084

reconsideration and allowance are requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Peter R. Hagerty  
Registration No. 42,618

Date: October 6, 2005  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (404) 607-9991  
Facsimile (404) 607-9981  
Customer No.: 23413

KOT-0084